

Strömgren photometry from $z = 0$ to $z \approx 1$. I. The method

Susanna Steindling¹, Noah Brosch²

Wise Observatory, School of Physics and Astronomy
Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv 69978, Israel

and

Karl D. Rakos³

Institute for Astronomy, University of Vienna, Türkenschanzstraße 17, 1180 Vienna,
Austria

ABSTRACT

We use rest-frame Strömgren photometry to observe clusters of galaxies in a self-consistent manner from $z=0$ to $z=0.8$. Strömgren photometry of galaxies is intended as a compromise between standard broad-band photometry and spectroscopy, in the sense that it is more sensitive to subtle variations in spectral energy distributions than the former, yet much less time-consuming than the latter. Principal Component Analysis (PCA) is used to facilitate extraction of information from the Strömgren data. By calibrating the Principal Components using well-studied galaxies, as well as models of stellar populations, we develop a purely empirical method to detect, and subsequently classify, cluster galaxies at all redshifts smaller than 0.8. Interlopers are discarded with unprecedented efficiency (up to 100 %). The first Principal Component essentially reproduces the Hubble Sequence, and can thus be used to determine the global star formation history of cluster members. The (PC2, PC3) plane allows us to identify Seyfert galaxies (and distinguish them from starbursts) based on photometric colors alone. In the case of E/S0 galaxies with known redshift, we are able to resolve the age-dust-metallicity degeneracy, albeit at the accuracy limit of our present observations. We use this technique in later papers to probe galaxy clusters well beyond their cores and to fainter magnitudes than spectroscopy can achieve, because the faint end of the luminosity function as

¹susan@wise.tau.ac.il

²noah@wise.tau.ac.il

³rakos@astro.univie.ac.at

well as the outer cluster regions seem to exhibit the strongest evolutionary trends. We are able to directly compare these data over the entire redshift range without a priori assumptions because our observations do not require first-order k-corrections. The compilation of such data for different cluster types over a wide redshift range is likely to set important constraints on the evolution of galaxies and on the clustering process.

Subject headings: galaxies: clusters: general — galaxies: evolution — galaxies: fundamental parameters — galaxies: photometry — methods: data analysis — techniques: photometric

1. Introduction

The study of galaxy evolution has benefited greatly from observations of galaxy clusters, because of better statistics (compared to pencil beam surveys), and because clusters are more easily identified than isolated galaxies at large redshifts (e.g., Couch et al. 1983, Dressler 1993). These studies revealed some of the most spectacular galaxy evolutionary trends, such as the Butcher-Oemler effect (Butcher & Oemler 1978). Since then, clusters of galaxies have been used as benchmarks to sample galaxy evolution at different redshifts (e.g., Butcher, Oemler & Wells 1983, Dressler et al. 1999).

However, data on galaxies in clusters are usually limited to the inner regions and/or to the brighter cluster members because of technical constraints; this selection effect biases the selection and comparison of clusters at different redshifts, as the fields of view and apparent magnitudes translate into different metric sizes and luminosities. The observed changes may therefore not be straightforward to interpret in terms of galactic evolution (e.g., Andreon & Etti 1999). Moreover, the galaxies are probably affected by the evolution of clustering itself. The modern view of hierarchical clustering (e.g., Baugh, Cole & Frenk 1996) suggests that the latter might outweigh the former. Thus, many degeneracies, both intrinsic and technical, plague the study of distant cluster galaxies. By intrinsic, we mean the difficulty to decide whether the observed redshift evolution of the galaxies is due to cosmological galaxy evolution, or rather the result of environmental effects, i.e., changes in cluster properties that affect the galaxies in it. Resolving this issue requires a coverage of the parameter space (redshift, cluster type, radial dependence,...) that does not yet exist.

The method described below is aimed at bringing this kind and quantity of data within reach. It is an observing and analysis technique that enables one to probe the luminosity function to fainter objects than can be reached spectroscopically, as well as to

cover more sparsely populated regions, such as poor clusters and the outskirts of rich ones, in a *consistent* manner for all redshifts up to $z=0.8$ (instrumental limitation). It conserves the advantages of classical photometry (depth and spatial coverage) but avoids its usual pitfalls, such as field contamination, k-corrections and loss of essential spectral information.

This paper is organized as follows: section 2 outlines the advantages of our rest-frame photometric observing technique. In the following sections we describe the properties of such data using Principal Component Analysis: in section 3 we show how to define cluster members in PC-space (the “cluster-box”), and demonstrate how efficiently stars as well as fore- and background galaxies are recognized in this new parameter space. After eliminating the interlopers, we show, in section 4, how to differentiate the various types of cluster members in that same parameter space, which is necessary to address questions of galaxy evolution. Effects of age, dust and metallicity, as well as AGN activity are discussed. Section 5 summarizes the method.

2. A new approach to extra-galactic photometry

2.1. Limitations of standard broad-band photometry

A spatially resolved galaxy spectrum is the richest information harvest an observer can hope for. However, at $z \gtrsim 0.3$ galaxies are barely a few arcseconds in size, and one has to settle, in most cases, for a single aperture spectrum. Ideally, one wishes to obtain the spectra of all the galaxies in a given cluster, thereby determining their redshift and cluster membership, and infer their star formation histories by comparing these spectra to evolutionary models. Unfortunately, even with the largest telescopes, this requires unreasonably large amounts of observing time, if one wishes to cover the entire range of cluster types and redshifts. Moreover, multi-slit or fiber spectroscopy introduces a selection bias by rendering simultaneous observations of close pairs or subgroups technically difficult and time-consuming, because of adjacency limitations due to the physical size of the fibers. Aperture effects, related to the fraction of the galaxy being sampled at different distances, slit position, etc., constitute additional complications.

The usual alternative is broad-band photometry, with which the pioneering work on distant galaxy clusters has begun. However, the gain in time offered by this method is often outweighed by the loss of spectral information. Firstly, most existing studies deal with field contamination only statistically (e.g., Wilson et al. 1997). Although photometric redshifts are in principle of good quality (see e.g., Connolly et al. 1995), they rely heavily on the U-band to catch the 4000 Å break at $z \leq 0.4$ or the rise in UV flux of star forming galaxies

for $z \leq 0.6$, but the U-band is usually not used in high- z cluster observations aimed at the visible range of the cluster galaxies’ SED.

Secondly, the large width of standard broadband filters causes smearing of spectral information. Hence, comparing photometric data to evolutionary synthesis models suffers from various degeneracies, such as the age-metallicity degeneracy (Worthey 1994).

An additional major problem arises when comparing photometric data from clusters at different redshifts, because the standard filters sample completely different regions of the rest-frame spectra. Such comparisons require large k -corrections, which are extremely morphology-dependent and presumably also evolution-dependent. In fact, they require *a priori* knowledge of the evolutionary effects one is looking for, a circular argument. In some lucky cases, standard filters at one redshift correspond roughly to other standard filters at another redshift (e.g., Stanford, Eisenhardt & Dickinson 1995, 1997), yet differential k -corrections still have to be made, and the datasets thus generated are somewhat heterogeneous and of limited common spectral coverage.

Lastly, the comparison of galaxies at various redshifts in search for evolutionary effects requires a meaningful selection criterion, which is valid over the entire z -range. This, too, is plagued by the inherent uncertainty of the k -corrections, which differ by up to one magnitude for different Hubble types (de Vaucouleurs, de Vaucouleurs & Corwin 1976).

2.2. The Strömgren Photometry

Rakos and coworkers have pioneered an observing technique that resolves, or at least alleviates, some of the aforementioned problems: extra-galactic *rest-frame* Strömgren photometry (see Rakos & Schombert 1995 and references therein). Unlike the Johnson system, the Strömgren filters have been intentionally *designed to match* specific signatures in the spectra of stars, that relate directly to the physical properties one wishes to investigate, such as temperature, metallicity, and surface gravity (Strömgren 1966). For technical reasons, Rakos et al. slightly modified the bandpass definitions, so that all four filters are now $\sim 200\text{\AA}$ wide, and their central wavelengths are $uz=3500\text{\AA}$, $vz=4100\text{\AA}$, $bz=4675\text{\AA}$, and $yz=5500\text{\AA}$ respectively. (The lower case z in the filter name refers to the rest-frame of the source.) These slight modifications do not influence the interpretation of the photometry, therefore we will not systematically distinguish “Strömgren filters” from “modified Strömgren filters” hereafter. We will omit the z and refer to these bands as (u, v, b, y) , understanding implicitly that they are “tuned” to the rest-frame of the target cluster.

Rakos, Schombert & Kreidl (1991), Rakos & Schombert (1995), and Rakos, Maindl & Schombert (1996), describe the original stellar interpretation of Strömgren fluxes and colors, and show how the same quantities can be used to characterize extra-galactic objects. Briefly, for homogeneous stellar populations, the $(u-v)$ color measures the strength of the 4000Å break, which can be used as an indicator of recent star formation. The $(b-y)$ color measures the slope of the continuum redward of the break. The b and y filters are situated in regions free of any prominent absorption features, thus $(b-y)$ should be a good indicator of mean stellar age, free of metallicity effects. The v filter, on the other hand, contains the region of the FeI+CN line blend. The photometric index $m = (v-b) - (b-y)$ can therefore be used to measure metallicity effects. Needless to say, when measuring real galaxy SEDs the colors are less straightforward to interpret, as the effects of mixed stellar populations and internal dust extinction are difficult to account for. For example, the H_δ line present in the spectra of hot stars introduces an age-dependence in the v filter. Therefore, we will rely in what follows on a more empirical approach.

In summary, the main advantages of this observing technique are: (1) the filters are designed to sample spectral regions, which are very sensitive to changes in the underlying physical properties, (2) these filters avoid all strong emission lines, which cause confusion in standard UVB photometry of active galaxies, and (3) observations are carried out at *fixed rest-frame* wavelengths, thus avoiding the uncertain k-corrections and delivering a self-consistent data set over the entire redshift range covered. Of course, this requires a priori knowledge of the cluster’s redshift.

With optical telescopes+cameras, the rest-frame Strömgren method can be applied to clusters from $z = 0$ to $z \sim 1$. However, the redshift segments $0.36 < z < 0.41$, $0.60 < z < 0.66$ and $0.83 < z < 0.89$ need special attention because of the atmospheric A-band contaminating the redshifted y , b or v filter respectively. This can in principle be calibrated out with an adequate spectrophotometric standard star, otherwise, these regions should be avoided.

3. Identification of cluster members via PCA

The basic approach adopted here is to assume that cluster galaxies concentrate in a specific location of the three-dimensional space defined by the Strömgren colors. We demonstrate this below for a number of field and cluster galaxy samples.

3.1. From colors to PCA space: Definition of the “cluster-box”

We collected large aperture spectra from the literature (Kennicutt 1992 and Kinney et al. 1996) and convolved them with synthetic Strömgren filter response curves, to simulate the appearance of known galaxy types in the three-dimensional $[(u-v), (v-b), (b-y)]$ color space (Fig. 1). The details of the samples are given in Tables 1 and 2. We insist on the “large aperture” selection criterion (although it limits the statistics of the template sample) because we will subsequently compare them to high redshift aperture photometry, and we want to avoid aperture-related color effects. Indeed, the color difference due to varying aperture sizes can be larger than the intrinsic color difference of different galaxy types observed through a constant aperture (see e.g., de Vaucouleurs, de Vaucouleurs & Corwin 1976 and Brosch & Shaviv 1982). This effect is expected to be even more severe in Strömgren colors, which are more sensitive to differences in stellar population (and their gradients). As will be shown at the end of this section, the sample nevertheless covers well the entire range of nearby galaxy types.

It is clear from Figure 1 that the ensemble of galaxies occupies a well confined, but difficult to fathom subspace, which we now want to define in the simplest possible way. Since the default coordinate system (consisting of the three axes $u-v$, $v-b$ and $b-y$) is impractical for this purpose, we performed a Principal Component Analysis (PCA) on the data points.

Briefly, a Principal Component Analysis, in any n -dimensional space, calculates the axis along which the data points present the largest, most significant scatter. This is called the first Principal Component (PC1). It then proceeds to calculate PC2, the axis of the second most significant spread in the remaining $n-1$ dimensional space orthogonal to the first Principal Component, and so on. Mathematically, this is done by normalizing the coordinates of the data points to standardized variables and calculating their covariance. The final output are the eigenvectors (the Principal Components) and eigenvalues of this covariance matrix. If, at one point, the standard deviation of the m -th Principal Component is no larger than the accuracy of the data, it means that the data can be fully described by only $n-m$ components. The gain of the PCA is therefore twofold: (1) it minimizes the dimensionality of the data and (2) it provides an orthonormal coordinate system in which the data are most easily characterized. The reader is referred to Lahav et al. (1996) for a more detailed description of PCA in an astronomical context.

The base vectors of the new coordinate system, in which we will from now on view the data, are :

$$\begin{aligned}
 PC1 &= 0.80(u - v) + 0.53(v - b) + 0.28(b - y) \\
 &= 0.8u - 0.27v - 0.25b - 0.28y \\
 PC2 &= -0.56(u - v) + 0.49(v - b) + 0.67(b - y) \\
 &= -0.56u + 1.05v + 0.18b - 0.67y \\
 PC3 &= 0.22(u - v) - 0.69(v - b) + 0.69(b - y) \\
 &= 0.22u - 0.91v + 1.38b - 0.69y
 \end{aligned}$$

Figure 2 gives a view of Kennicutt’s and Kinney’s galaxies in this new coordinate system (PC-space). Note that the only difference between Figures 1 and 2 (i.e., the transformation matrix between color-space and PCA-space) is a simple 3D rotation. Yet, Figure 2 appears much simpler! The PC-space not only renders features more easily identifiable to the eye, it also facilitates automatic machine treatment of the data by providing a set of independent variables. The new coordinates being a linear combination of the original ones, we refer to them as “colors” too in what follows. Note that PC2 and PC3 can also be understood as curvature indices, as in Koo (1985).

Since galaxy spectra vary continuously along (and across) the Hubble sequence (Kennicutt 1992a, 1992b), the color space they occupy must also be continuous. We therefore choose to define the allowed space for cluster galaxies as the box defined by the maximal extent of the distribution in the new coordinate space (see Fig. 2). Because our observations are made at fixed *rest-frame* wavelengths, this cluster-box is essentially invariant with redshift. One might argue that differential k-corrections will still have to be made, because the rest-frame *width* of our filters changes with redshift, but these corrections (1) are very small, and (2) can easily be avoided by redshifting the template spectra and recalculating their colors. This will only be required if high precision photometry ($dm \sim 0.01 - 0.02$) is available or for comparisons of clusters over $dz > 0.4$. If one wants to avoid this additional computation step, it is permissible to simply use the values obtained for templates shifted to $z = 0.4$ (the middle of our redshift range). As can be seen in Figure 3, the differences in PC-colors due to the spectral stretching are negligible in most cases and can be accounted for by a slight widening of the cluster-box boundaries when the difference for certain spectral types becomes of the order of the PC-color accuracy.

In PC-space, the averages and standard deviations of the galaxies’ coordinates are:

$$\langle PC1 \rangle = 0.35 \quad \sigma_{PC1} = 0.45$$

$$\langle PC2 \rangle = -0.18 \quad \sigma_{PC2} = 0.10$$

$$\langle PC3 \rangle = -0.08 \quad \sigma_{PC3} = 0.05$$

Thus, the color-space occupied by “normal” galaxies (all but AGNs) is almost two-dimensional. The first two PCs alone contain 93.8 % and 4.9 % of the data’s variance respectively, and together account for 98.7 % of the total variance. This means that, in practice, a two-dimensional parameter space suffices to describe the entire range of Hubble types and the different subgroups therein. In fact, one single combination (PC1) is already extremely comprehensive! The ensemble of galaxies has the largest scatter (larger than in any original color-plane) in the (PC1, PC2) plane, which makes it useful for distinguishing among different types of galaxies, as will be described in section 4. PC3 exhibits the smallest scatter, its standard deviation is of the order of the measurement uncertainties, and its full extent amounts only to 0.22 mag. Thus PC3 can be used as a characteristic to separate cluster galaxies from other objects, as will be described in sections 3.2 and 3.3.

The three PCA components define, therefore, a three-dimensional volume, which contains all the galaxy templates. We call this volume “the cluster-box”, because the only condition we imposed on the SED templates was that they be at $z=0$. Assuming that the spectral variety of local galaxies is representative of the evolution of galaxies from $z=1$ to the present, the cluster-box ought to be invariant in rest-frame observations of distant cluster galaxies.

3.1.1. Robustness: error estimates

How are the PCs affected by measurement uncertainties in the input spectra? The noise in the four original bands being uncorrelated by definition, implies that:

$$M = S + N$$

where M and S are the correlation matrices of the measured colors and the pure signal respectively, and N (the correlation matrix of the noise) is diagonal, the i -th term on the diagonal being the variance of the noise in the i -th color. If the variance of the noise is the same for all colors, the eigenvectors of S and M are identical, i.e., the Principal Components are unaffected by noise. However, it is more realistic to assume that the noise in $(u-v)$

is, say, twice as large, as in the two other bands. We have simulated this situation by creating 1000 mock sets of template spectra by adding random noise drawn from a normal distribution with FWHM=0.1 mag for $u-v$ and FWHM=0.05 mag for $(v-b)$ and $(b-y)$, the typical uncertainties in the colors derived from the Kennicutt spectra, and performed PCA on each one of these. The median deviation angles are $1^\circ.3$ for PC1, $4^\circ.6$ for PC2 and $5^\circ.4$ for PC3. The corresponding values and standard deviations for the coefficients of the Principal Components are :

$$PC1 = 0.81(\pm 0.01)(u - v) + 0.52(\pm 0.01)(v - b) + 0.28(\pm 0.01)(b - y)$$

$$PC2 = -0.56(\pm 0.02)(u - v) + 0.56(\pm 0.03)(v - b) + 0.61(\pm 0.04)(b - y)$$

$$PC3 = 0.16(\pm 0.03)(u - v) - 0.65(v - b)(\pm 0.03) + 0.74(\pm 0.03)(b - y)$$

The small scatter proves that the cluster-box is very robust against uncertainties in the input spectra. For PC1 and PC2 this is not surprising, because it is an intrinsic property of PCA to cancel out uncorrelated variations (noise) in the presence of (correlated) variations in signal. Folkes, Lahav & Maddox (1996) have shown that the high order PCs, which are dominated by noise, can vary greatly in such simulations. In our case, however, the only noise-affected component is PC3, and since we are working in three-dimensional space, once PC1 and PC2 are established, the third component is fully determined. Thus even PC3 is robust.

3.1.2. Completeness

Next, we want to verify whether the PC space defined above is not too restrictive to include all possible galaxy types (our galaxy sample is quite conservative, because Kennicutt’s sample is restricted to local field galaxies, and spatially integrated spectra are otherwise rare in the literature). We therefore performed the same analysis on a list of Strömgren colors of 143 galaxies compiled by one of us (KR). This list includes 63 of the Kennicutt galaxies as representatives of normal galaxies, 41 Seyfert galaxies from de Bruyn & Sargent (1978), 17 dust-rich galaxies (IRAS sources) from Ashby, Houck & Hacking (1992), as well as 37 nearby and distant cluster galaxies from Yee & Oke (1978) and Gunn & Oke (1975) to avoid any cluster/field or redshift bias (see Table 3 for details). Figure 4 summarizes the morphological breakup of the three tables in form of histograms. This sample covers a wider range of spectromorphological⁴ types than the Kennicutt + Kinney

⁴The term “spectromorphological” denotes the fact that, although the original Hubble typing is based on morphology, its terminology is often applied to the spectral sequence of galaxies, because of the reasonable correlation between them.

et al. list, namely it contains strong AGNs, more starbursts, and cluster galaxies (cD's,...). Such objects are known to be present in distant clusters, therefore we must ensure that the selection criterion described above, based on the cluster-box, is not biased against them. The disadvantage of the Rakos sample is that it does not always meet the large aperture condition. This is namely the case of the IRAS galaxies, the Seyfert spectra of de Bruyn & Sargent, and some of the Yee & Oke objects.

The space generated by all normal galaxies, as well as Seyfert 2s, in this test-sample is nearly identical to the original PCA-cluster-box. In fact, all the galaxies of the Rakos sample, except pure Seyferts and some IR-bright galaxies, fall within the cluster-box defined above. In order to retain the aperture criterion, we will define the galaxy-PCA-space as the union of two subspaces, one of normal galaxies - as defined at the beginning of this section - and one of galaxies with active nuclei (Seyfert-box), as displayed in Figure 5. In the case of the latter, aperture effects are less important because most of the emitted light originates from a small nuclear region. Plotted also in Figure 5 are the IR-bright galaxies from Ashby et al. (1992). Some of them lie outside the cluster-box and are therefore visible (as x-es) in Figure 5. Visual inspection of their spectra reveals that they do not represent a distinct category of galaxies, but rather the highly dust-reddened versions of mixed AGN-starburst galaxies.

In summary, an object is identified as cluster member if it lies within either of the two boxes defined above. In a second step, one can "redden" the two boxes to search for dust-enshrouded cluster members. This makes our selection criterion essentially free of any evolutionary bias. There remains a possibility that a distant cluster might harbor a galaxy so peculiar that it resembles nothing we know from the local samples. We accept, as a caveat, that the membership selection might reject very few and very peculiar objects, but we consider such a possibility very unlikely and estimate that it will not influence significantly our evolutionary conclusions.

3.2. Star contamination

Images of galaxy clusters will always be contaminated by foreground stars. Bright stars are easily identified and discarded, but faint ones can be mistaken for small, compact galaxies at high redshift, especially in observations with degraded spatial resolution.

The rest-frame observing technique can considerably alleviate this problem. The rest-frame ($z=0.2$ to $z=0.8$) Strömgren filters will sample the *red* portion of the stellar ($z=0$) spectra, away from the distinctive features they were originally designed to match.

This yields unrealistic stellar colors.

In order to investigate this further, we simulated stellar contamination by folding the theoretical flux distributions from the lcb97⁵ library of stellar atmospheres (Lejeune, Cuisinier & Buser 1997, 1998), covering spectral types O - M and luminosity classes I, III and V, with the redshifted Strömgren filter response curves for $0.1 \leq z_{obs} \leq 0.8$. The lcb97 is the most complete stellar library to date, covering $2000K \leq T_{eff} \leq 50,000K$, $-1.02 \leq \log \leq 5.5$, and $-5.0 \leq \log Z/Z_{\odot} \leq +1.0$ in a uniform grid. In the three-dimensional PC-space no star lies inside the Seyfert-box and most stars lie well outside the cluster-box (empty space in Figure 6). Figure 6 shows only those stellar types that are indistinguishable from galaxies in the redshift range $0.1 \leq z_{obs} \leq 0.8$. The conclusion is that in observations of clusters at any given redshift, only a certain subgroup of F, G, and K stars will contaminate the data. The precise spectral types of the intruding subgroup will depend on the redshift of the target cluster.

The actual number of such stars depends on galactic coordinates. This is dealt with statistically, as follows. For each cluster, the Bahcall-Soneira Galaxy model⁶ (Bahcall 1986) is used to predict the number of such stars along the line of sight. This model of the Milky Way is the combination of a disk and spheroid, each with its own luminosity function, that predicts the projected stellar number density vs. apparent magnitude and B-V color for given Galactic coordinates, as well as the breakdown between dwarf and giant stars. Despite its very simple assumptions, the model fits amazingly well the observed star counts (Bahcall & Soneira 1984).

This is best illustrated by an example : Cl0016+16, a cluster at $z=0.54$, has been observed by KR at KPNO. At that redshift, only stellar types F8I-K2I, F2III-K3III and F2V-K4V in the magnitude range $m(V)=18.7 - 22.5$ (brightest cluster galaxy and limiting magnitude of the observation, respectively) can contaminate the galaxy counts. Figure 7 shows the projection of the sheet containing the stellar models onto the first two PC's. In this case, the field of view was 7×7 square arcminutes. The Bahcall-Soneira program predicts about 15 such stars within the frame. This is an upper limit, as the incompleteness at faint magnitudes has not been folded into the calculation. For our observations of A115 ($z=0.191$, Rakos et al. 2000), covering a circular region of 10 arcminutes in diameter, 2.6 stars brighter than $m(V)=21.25$ (faintest object detected) are predicted to contaminate the cluster-box. This calculation takes the incompleteness function into account.

⁵<http://www.astro.unibas.ch/~lejeune>

⁶<http://www.sns.ias.edu/~jnb/Html/galaxy.html>

Since - as will be shown in section 4 - different galaxy types occupy distinct regions of the cluster-box, we also know to which class of galaxies the stellar contamination correction needs to be applied, according to the position of these stars *within* the cluster-box.

Contamination by stars in the region of highly reddened cluster galaxies is not an issue, as stars have low PC2 values (see Fig. 7), whereas reddened objects have increasingly high PC2 values (see reddening vector in Fig. 10).

3.3. Redshift discrimination

Probably *the* most severe weakness of cluster photometry is contamination by foreground and background galaxies, especially when trying to investigate the outskirts of clusters and/or its faintest members. Considerations of apparent size and magnitude do not help to resolve this issue, as both quantities change rather slowly with redshift beyond $z=0.2$, while the intrinsic scatter at any given redshift is very large. The only constraint they yield, is that galaxies brighter and/or larger than the first-ranked cluster galaxy can be immediately discarded as foreground, but the density of such field galaxies is so low that it hardly improves the situation. For the purpose of the following simulations, we have adopted $M_V(\textit{brightest}) = -22.68$ (Hoessel, Gunn & Thuan 1980), $H_o = 60$, and $q_o = 0.5$. When dealing with real cluster data, we will replace this by the observed value.

Connolly et al. (1995) have demonstrated the efficiency of photometric redshift determinations, which rely mainly on the shifting of the $4000\text{\AA}$ break through the successive filter passbands. Along the same line of thought, Fiala, Rakos & Stockton (1986) have used the marked difference in their $b-y$ and mz indices to identify cluster ellipticals at various redshifts. However, the situation becomes less clear when dealing with the whole gamut of galaxy types, as intrinsic spectral differences become entangled with differences due to redshift. For early type galaxies, the shifting (with redshift) of the $4000\text{\AA}$ break through the filter bandpasses makes cluster membership identification relatively easy, but this criterion becomes useless for active galaxies with flat spectra, as well as for any foreground galaxy, that is sampled only redward of the break. In the latter cases, one has to rely on a combination of more subtle features, such as emission and absorption lines, increasing the dimensionality of the problem. Here again, PC-space offers the most efficient cure.

In order to assess the efficiency of rest-frame Strömgren photometry at identifying, and subsequently discarding, interlopers from the list of cluster galaxies, we have artificially redshifted the Kinney galaxy template spectra from $z_{gal} = 0.0$ to $z_{gal} = 0.80$ in steps of $\delta z = 0.005$, to simulate field galaxies. We then simulated rest-frame cluster observations

over that same redshift range (z_{obs}) and calculated for each template the PC-colors at every point in the (z_{gal}, z_{obs}) space. If the PC-colors of the redshifted template are inconsistent with the cluster-box, the field galaxy will be successfully identified as an interloper. The results are (pessimistically) summarized in Figure 8, which shows four representative examples. For each galaxy type we shaded that area in the (z_{gal}, z_{obs}) plane where the galaxy’s PCs lie *inside* the cluster-box. The patch along the principal diagonal ($z_{gal} = z_{obs}$) represents the *correct* identification of cluster members, the other patches are *failures* of the system to recognize field galaxies. Success is demonstrated by the emptiness of the figure. Photometric uncertainties (typically 0.05 mag) have been included in this calculation and make the interloper strips twice as wide as they would be in the ideal (zero error) case. The main conclusion is that our system recognizes background galaxies extremely well: only a small fraction of background starburst galaxies are not recognized. Foreground galaxies are more problematic, many will be mistaken as cluster members. This is not dramatic for low and intermediate redshift observations, because the foreground volume subtended by the image size is rather small, but it can be a problem for high- z observations. Luckily, this will be somewhat balanced by the smaller magnitude range (to the detection limit) spanned by cluster members at high z . It is worth noting that 70 % of the successful identifications are due to PC3 alone. Indeed, as stated in the previous section, the allowed range in PC3 for normal galaxies is very small and there is no visible trend of rest-frame-PC3 vs. galaxy type. This means that PC3 is a characteristic quantity for *any* kind of galaxy (except AGNs) at the right redshift.

Since our field galaxy identifier is not perfect, we estimate in what follows the actual number of interlopers remaining after the rejection procedure. Approximately 15 % of local field galaxies are currently undergoing starbursts (T. Contini, private communication). The remaining 85 % can be split according to their morphology into 8/10 spirals, 1/10 S0s and 1/10 ellipticals (Sandage & Tamman 1979). This yields a spectrophotometric breakup of 15 % starburst galaxies, 68 % spirals and 17 % ellipticals and S0s at $z=0$. We estimate the redshift evolution of the spectromorphological breakup based on the luminosity density evolution estimated by Lilly et al. (1996). They find that the contribution from galaxy types Sbc or later roughly doubles by $z=0.75-1.00$ in the 4400 Å as well as in the one micron bands. Assuming a one-to-one relationship between luminosity density and number counts, we estimate that the fractional contribution of our starburst category also doubles, increasing to about 30 % at $z=1$ at the expense of the other types. Thus, we can calculate the fraction of field galaxies that our algorithm will recognize as a function of z_{obs} and z_{gal} . Note that the zero-redshift estimate of the spectromorphological breakup takes into account the typical completeness limits of our observations ($I_{AB} = 20 - 21$ mag), whereas its redshift-evolution is derived from the CFRS, which is complete to $I_{AB} = 22.5$.

This causes us to somewhat overestimate the number of high redshift, star-forming galaxies visible in our frames, due to the luminosity-dependence of galaxy evolution. However, as long as $z_{obs} < 0.7$, the field galaxy rejection mechanism works at nearly 100% efficiency for high redshift ($z_{gal} > 0.7$) galaxies (fig. 8 and 9), eliminating this uncertainty from the end result "number of unidentifiable field galaxies". For $z_{obs} > 0.7$, the numbers quoted are upper limits.

Figure 9 shows the percentage of galaxies whose colors are within the cluster-box boundaries. The peak along the principal diagonal is produced by the cluster galaxies themselves. Success at identifying interlopers corresponds to low values in this figure. In order to explain the width of the peak, Figures 10a-10c show - for $z_{obs} = 0.1, 0.4$ and 0.7 respectively - the effect of small redshift deviations ($-0.1 \leq \delta z \leq 0.1$) about the cluster mean. The details depend on galaxy type and redshift of observation. Overall, background objects are more easily discarded than foreground, and early type galaxies more easily than late types. The regions of redshift space, where immediate fore- or background galaxies still fall within the cluster-box boundaries or into the Seyfert-box (see stb3 in Fig. 10a) are accounted for statistically.

We choose to normalize the fraction displayed in Figure 9 by the statistically complete spectroscopic subset of the Canada-France Redshift Survey (Lilly et al. 1995; Crampton et al. 1995) to obtain actual numbers. Its completeness limits ($17.5 \leq I_{AB} \leq 22.5$) are consistent with our deepest cluster observations. Each cluster observation is limited by the flux of objects in its respective yz filter, which corresponds to *rest-frame* m_{5500} . Therefore each yz filter "sees" a different portion of the field galaxies' SED (depending on z_{gal}), which implies that the number of field galaxies seen in cluster observations varies with z_{obs} . The same procedure can be applied to the Seyfert-box separately. Figure 11 displays the number density of remaining interlopers in the cluster-box (pluses) and the Seyfert-box (x-es) in three magnitude bins, as a function of z_{obs} . The efficiency of our algorithm in rejecting interlopers varies between 50 and 100 %, depending on the magnitude bin and redshift of observation. Note that this statistical estimate does not take into account the unknown, large-scale clustering features of the observed fields.

Contamination of the reddened boxes can be calculated the same way. Reddened Seyfert-boxes are essentially free of contamination, as well as cluster-boxes for $A_V > 1.5$. Less reddened cluster-boxes suffer very small contamination.

Our goal is to detect evolution in cluster galaxies. Hence the question of interest is: What is the weakest evolutionary trend we can positively detect, in spite of the remaining interlopers ? The answer depends not only on z_{obs} , but also on the overdensity in a given cluster region. In the central regions of rich clusters, field contamination is not an issue

because the overdensity can reach a few hundred, but previous studies (Rakos, Odell & Schombert 1997) indicate that the outer regions are of interest, because the preferred location of the star-forming galaxies constitutes an important clue to the physical processes at work. Figure 12 shows the fraction of unidentifiable interlopers likely to remain in our data sets after the cluster-box test, as a function of z_{obs} and overdensity. As long as the overdensity is larger than 10, our worst case of field galaxy identification (50 %) is sufficient to remove any uncertainty introduced by the field galaxies. And even in regions only twice as dense as the field, the remaining contamination is as little as 10 % at $z=0.1$ and 30 % at $z=0.8$! Since we can also determine the location within the cluster-box of these interlopers, we can make very precise corrections to our cluster statistics.

3.3.1. Cluster velocity dispersion

The peculiar velocities of galaxies in clusters can be very large, velocity dispersions of 1000 - 1500 km s^{-1} are commonly cited in the literature. Lately, smaller values tend to be published, based on the virialized population only and where substructures have been separated, but these considerations do not apply to our study, as we are interested in infalling galaxies as well and prefer to regard a recent merger of two sub-clusters as one unit.

Our filters are wide enough to accommodate the red- and blue-shifts introduced by these large velocities without any substantial change in colors, i.e., a genuine cluster member with a peculiar velocity of 1500 km s^{-1} or even 3000 km s^{-1} will not be mistakenly discarded as an interloper. The most significant difference in PC-colors between a galaxy at rest and one with a velocity of $\pm 1500 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ is 0.0146 in PC1 for an S0 (44% of the measurement uncertainty), but typical values are much smaller, of the order of 0.004 - 0.012 (10%-15% of the measurement uncertainties). For a velocity of $\pm 3000 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ these values roughly double, but such objects are much rarer. We conclude therefore, that the width of our filters is well adapted to the cluster velocity dispersion and that peculiar velocities do not bias our classification.

4. Physical interpretation of the Principal Components

So far, we have focused on defining the ensemble of cluster galaxies as a whole vs. other objects that are likely to populate the parameter space. The next step is to “zoom in” on this ensemble, in order to characterize differences among cluster members themselves.

The preceding discussion is entirely based on purely observational quantities and empirical relations. We will now show how the same quantities can be used to differentiate between different types of cluster galaxies. The aim of this section is to outline briefly the link between the Principal Components and the underlying physical properties of galaxies. In a follow-up publication, we will examine in greater detail the behavior of PC-colors as a function of physical properties of galaxies (age, metallicity, internal extinction, mixed stellar populations,...) via population synthesis models.

4.1. PC1: The Hubble Sequence

The first Principal Component, PC1, follows essentially the Hubble sequence, from Ellipticals with the highest positive values of PC1 to Irregulars with the most negative PC1s. We have tested this assumption on the “normal” galaxies in our sample, i.e., the Kennicutt galaxies for which no nuclear activity or any signs of interaction with another galaxy has been detected (Figure 13). We have relied on the NED database for morphological classification. The statistics of this sample being rather poor, as only one third of the Kennicutt galaxies meet the above criteria, we use population synthesis models to firm up our statement.

Old stellar populations are represented by G. Worthey’s models⁷ (1994). Figure 14 shows that the location of single burst populations viewed after 1 to 18 Gyrs (from left to right) are consistent with the location of early type galaxies. Only a solar metallicity burst (pluses) and a $Z/Z_{\odot} = -2$ model (x-es) are shown in the figure for clarity. Other sub-solar metallicity bursts, or superpositions of bursts, yield similar results. We use the Starburst99⁸ models (Leitherer et al. 1999) to model young stellar populations. The region occupied by late type galaxies (left side of the cluster-box) can be fitted with moderately reddened bursts of star formation (Fig. 15a), as well as with continuous star formation (Fig. 15b), viewed at least 4 Myrs after the initial burst. The figures show only the tracks for solar metallicity and a Salpeter IMF, but the situation is not much different for other metallicities and Initial Mass Functions. The tracks range from 1 to 900 Myrs (the age-range provided by the models), with approximate ages marked on the figures. The models lie left of the cluster-box for the first few million years. This is also the location of individual HII regions. We have nevertheless *not* extended the cluster-box to cover this region, because the unlikely chance to catch a galaxy in such a stage with large aperture

⁷http://199.120.161.183/~worthey/dial/dial_a_model.html

⁸<http://www.stsci.edu/science/starburst99>

photometry would be outweighed by the contamination from stars and field galaxies that this would falsely include in the cluster. Note that the models do not account for an older underlying population, which is certainly present in large aperture photometry. It is therefore not surprising that many template galaxies lie on neither of the simplistic tracks shown here. The Starburst99 models also do not account for metal enrichment or internal extinction, and are, therefore, not directly comparable to large aperture galaxy photometry. Both effects tend to make the evolutionary tracks more horizontal, under the assumption that heavy elements need to be produced (and ejected) before they start to affect the SED.

Both observations and models indicate that PC1 increases monotonically with mean stellar age. The "loop" at $t \sim 10\text{Myrs}$ in Fig. 15a is an artefact of the modeling technique. Thus, PC1 is a good indicator of global star formation history. By comparing Figure 13 to Figure 10, one can see that large peculiar velocities would not alter the classification, as differential redshift effects are mainly perpendicular to PC1, and are generally small. Also shown in Figure 10 are the internal reddening vectors for $A_V = 1$. Note that the templates, from which the cluster-box was constructed are spatially integrated spectra of real galaxies and therefore they are already reddened by the amount of dust present in each galaxy. The vectors of "additional reddening" indicate that (a) a cluster galaxy that is unusually reddened will come to lie outside the cluster-box, but such objects can be specifically searched for (see section 3.1.2). Late type and Seyfert galaxies, shifted by $A_V \sim 1.5 - 3.0$, would resemble the IR-luminous galaxies detected by IRAS. (b) Galaxies with only slightly more reddening than is usual for their type are moved along PC1 towards earlier types.

4.2. [PC2,PC3]: Active Galactic Nuclei

It has already been hinted in section 3.1 (Fig. 5) that most galaxies with active nuclei do not fit into the cluster-box. Their total (nucleus + host) PC1 values are not much different from those of normal galaxies (slightly bluer, but we cannot determine on the basis of our sample how much of this is a real trend or due to aperture effects), but their location in the [PC2, PC3] plane is inconsistent with any kind of normal galaxy. Since the Hubble sequence is essentially parallel to PC1, any trend seen in the plane perpendicular to it will be independent of Hubble type.

Figure 16 displays all the Seyfert galaxies from the Kennicutt and Rakos samples in the [PC2, PC3] plane. The projections of the cluster-box and Seyfert-box (defined in section 3.1.2, see Figure 5 for a 3D view) are also shown. There is a clear trend with Seyfert type: Sy2s are indistinguishable from normal galaxies, but Seyfert types 1.5 to 1 tend to lie further away from the cluster-box, mainly due to their low PC3 values, which are signatures

of the nuclear flux. This trend can be interpreted in terms of inclination of the host galaxy (Antonucci 1993) determining the relative contribution of the nucleus and host galaxy stellar population to the total SED, and it is to be expected that aperture effects cause a similar trend. Thus, PC3 will not detect *every* active nucleus (unless the spatial resolution is good enough to permit adequate surface photometry) but it will surely identify galaxies in which the signature of nuclear activity dominates the spectrum (i.e., the object is in the Seyfert-box). Note that contamination of the Seyfert-box is very small: For most z_{obs} , not even one star is likely to reside within it, and the field galaxies (see Figure 11) are also very few (at most one, for our observations of three $z \sim 0.2$ clusters).

4.3. PC3: The age-metallicity degeneracy

One of the major drawbacks of standard optical broad-band photometry is the age-dust-metallicity degeneracy (Worthey 1994; Charlot, Worthey & Bressan 1996), that can only be resolved by adding specific line-indices, at high observing time cost (for the metallicity) and UV+IR bands for the dust. We found that PCA on rest-frame Strömgren photometry can resolve this degeneracy, if redshift information is independently available.

Figure 17 displays the models for old stellar populations in the [PC1, PC3] plane. In this plane, the dust reddening vector is at a large enough angle from the line formed by the various ages and metallicities, that substantial reddening can be distinguished from age and metallicity effects. The extinction by dust was calculated assuming the reddening law of Savage & Mathis (1979) and a simple intervening layer geometry. We have not used other reddening laws, such as LMC- or SMC-type laws, because they do not differ from the Milky Way law in the optical domain (Calzetti 1998). Inspection of the reddening laws produced by more complicated geometries, such as unevenly distributed, clumpy dust (Calzetti 1997) suggests that the main difference will be only in the normalization, and not in the orientation of the reddening vector. We can thus lift the dust-degeneracy in galaxy photometry, provided the nature and distribution of the dust, derived from nearby objects, holds at least for $z \leq 1$.

In Figure 18 we have plotted the evolutionary tracks of old stellar populations for different metallicities in the [PC2, PC3] plane. None of them overlap, which means that in principle, the age-metallicity degeneracy is resolved in this set of coordinates. In practice, our typical measurement uncertainties (~ 0.05) will allow us to make only qualitative metallicity statements, except for the brightest cluster galaxies, for which 1 % photometric accuracy is achievable. Again, this requires prior knowledge of the galaxy’s redshift at the percent level (see Fig. 10).

The combination of these two figures enables us to disentangle the effects of age, metallicity, and dust for old ($\geq 1\text{Gyr}$), single stellar populations, based on only three optical colors.

5. Summary

We have shown how rest-frame photometry using intermediate-band filters, an observing technique developed by KR, fills the gap between standard photometric and spectroscopic observations of galaxy clusters. The advantages of this method are:

- Large fields of view can be acquired in a single telescope pointing and all sources present can be observed and analyzed simultaneously (the usual advantages of photometry).
- The use of filters *tuned* to the redshift of each cluster largely overcomes the usual problem of k-corrections, allowing direct comparison of data over arbitrary large redshift ranges, without any a priori theoretical assumptions.

In this paper, we have systematized the analysis of such data using the technique of Principal Component Analysis. We have applied PCA to synthetic Strömgren colors of a sample of well-known, nearby galaxies covering as much as possible all galactic properties. We demonstrated that PCA:

- Finds the orthonormal coordinate space in which the data are most simply described. This makes it very easy to fully automate all subsequent analysis.
- Improves and separates the information content of the data. Combined with the wise choice of the filter’s rest-frame central wavelengths, we thus gain a considerable amount of spectral information without recourse to actual spectroscopy.

Based on a training set of nearby galaxies, we have shown that we are able to:

- Substantially reduce contamination by field stars and fore- or background galaxies,
- Characterize the global star-formation histories of cluster galaxies, and
- Identify AGN activity of cluster members (via the Seyfert-box).

- By analyzing models of stellar populations in the same manner, we have resolved the age-dust-metallicity degeneracy for old (≥ 1 Gyr.) stellar populations. This promises new insights on the cosmological evolution of dust and metallicity, when applied to cluster ellipticals at various redshifts.

We believe that the ratio of information to observing and reduction time required for the application of this method makes it an ideal tool for cluster galaxy surveys, because it allows one to address simultaneously many evolutionary issues, such as dependence on redshift as well as on environment (cluster type, location within a cluster, ...).

Many thanks to Ofer Lahav for sharing his experience in PCA and to Thierry Contini for discussions on starburst galaxy statistics. We are grateful to H. Netzer for helping us classify AGN and IRAS spectra and reading so many drafts of this paper. We also express our gratitude to the referee, David Koo, for constructive remarks that improved this paper.

This research has made use of the NASA/IPAC Extragalactic Database (NED) which is operated by the Jet Propulsion Laboratory, California Institute of Technology, under contract with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Research at the Wise Observatory is supported in part by a grant from the Israel Science Foundation. S. Steindling was supported partly by a grant from the US-Israel Binational Science Foundation.

REFERENCES

- Andreon, S. & Ettori S. 1999, ApJ, 516, 647
Ashby, M., Houck, J. & Hacking P. 1992, AJ, 104, 980
Bahcall, J. 1986, ARA&A, 44, 73
Bahcall, J. & Soneira, R. 1984, ApJS, 55, 67
Baugh, C. M., Cole, S. & Frenk, C. S. 1996, MNRAS, 283, 1361
Belloni, P. & Roeser, H. 1996, A&AS, 118, 65
Brosch, N. & Shaviv, G. 1982, ApJ, 253, 526
Butcher, H. & Oemler, A. 1978, ApJ, 219, 18
Butcher, H., Oemler, A. & Wells, D. 1983, ApJS, 52, 183
Calzetti, D. 1997, AJ, 113, 162

- Calzetti, D. 1998, in Proceedings of the 33rd Rencontres de Moriond on Dwarf Galaxies and Cosmology, ed. T. X. Thuan, C. Balkowski, V. Cayette & J. Tran Thanh Van
- Calzetti, D., Kinney, A. & Storchi-Bergmann, T. 1994, *ApJ*, 429, 582
- Charlot, S., Worthey, G. & Bressan, A. 1996, *ApJ*, 457, 625
- Connolly, A. J., Csabai, I., Szalay, A. S., Koo, D. C., Kron, R. G. & Munn, J. A. 1995, *AJ*, 110, 6
- Contini, T. 1998, private communication
- Couch, W., Ellis, R., Godwin, J. & Carter, D. 1983, *MNRAS*, 205, 1287
- Couch, W. J., Ellis, R. S., Sharples, R. M. & Smail, I. 1993, in ASP Conf. Ser., Vol. 51, *Observational Cosmology*, ed. G. Chincarini, A. Iovino, T. Maccacaro & D. Maccagni (Astron. Soc. Pac., San Francisco), p.240
- Crampton, D., Le Fèvre, O., Lilly, S. & Hammer, F. 1995, *ApJ*, 455, 96
- de Bruyn, A. & Sargent, W. 1978, *AJ*, 83, 1257
- de Vaucouleurs, G., de Vaucouleurs, A. & Corwin, H. G. 1976, *Second Reference Catalogue of Bright Galaxies* (University of Texas Press)
- Dressler, A. 1993, in ASP Conf. Ser., Vol. 51, *Observational Cosmology*, ed. G. Chincarini, A. Iovino, T. Maccacaro & D. Maccagni (Astron. Soc. Pac., San Francisco), p.225
- 1993, in ASP Conf. Ser., Vol. 51, *Observational Cosmology*, ed. G. Chincarini, A. Iovino, T. Maccacaro & D. Maccagni (Astron. Soc. Pac., San Francisco), p.240
- Dressler, A., Smail, I., Poggianti, B., Butcher, H., Couch, W., Ellis, R. & Oemler, A. 1999, *ApJS*, 122, 51
- Fiala, N., Rakos, K. & Stockton, A. 1986, *PASP*, 98, 70
- Folkes, S., Lahav, O. & Maddox, S. 1996, *MNRAS*, 283, 651
- Gunn, J. & Oke, J. 1975, *ApJ*, 195, 255
- Hoessel, J., Gunn, J. & Thuan, T. 1980, *ApJ*, 241, 486
- Kennicutt, R. C. 1992a, *ApJS*, 79, 255
- Kennicutt, R. C. 1992b, *ApJ*, 388, 310
- Kinney, A., Calzetti, D., Bohlin, R., McQuade, K., Storchi-Bergmann, T. & Schmitt, H. 1996, *ApJ*, 467, 38
- Koo, D. C. 1985, *AJ*, 90, 418
- Lahav, O., Naim, A., Sodr , L. & Storrie-Lombardi, M. C. 1996, *MNRAS*, 283, 207

- Leitherer, C., Schaerer, D., Goldader, J., Gonzales-Delgado, R., Robert, C., Kune, D., de Mello, D., Devost, D. & Heckman, T. 1999, *ApJS*, 123, 3
- Lilly, S., Le Fèvre, O., Crampton, D., Hammer, F. & Tresse, L. 1995, *ApJ*, 455, 50
- Lilly, S., Le Fèvre, O., Hammer, F. & Crampton, D. 1996, *ApJ*, 460, L1
- Lejeune, T., Cuisinier, F. & Buser, R. 1997, *A&AS*, 125, 229
- Lejeune, T., Cuisinier, F. & Buser, R. 1998, *A&AS*, 130, 65
- Rakos, K. D., Maindl, T. I. & Schombert, J. M. 1996, *ApJ*, 466, 122
- Rakos, K. D., Odell, A. & Schombert, J. 1997, *ApJ*, 490, 194
- Rakos, K. D. & Schombert, J. M. 1995, *ApJ*, 439, 47
- Rakos, K. D., Schombert, J. M. & Kreidl, T. J. 1991, *ApJ*, 377, 382
- Rakos, K., Schombert, J., Odell, A. & Steindling, S. 2000, *ApJ*, accepted, (astro-ph/0004346)
- Sandage, A. & Tamman, G. 1979, Revised Shapley-Ames Catalog
- Savage & Mathis 1979, *ARA&A*, 17, 73
- Stanford, S. A., Eisenhardt, P. R. M. & Dickinson, M. E. 1995, *ApJ*, 450, 512
- Stanford, S. A., Eisenhardt, P. R. M. & Dickinson, M. E. 1998, *ApJ*, 492, 461
- Strömgren, B. 1966, *ARA&A*, 4, 443
- Wilson, G., Smail, I., Ellis, R. & Couch, W. 1997, *MNRAS*, 284, 915
- Worthey, G. 1994, *ApJS*, 95, 107
- Yee, H. & Oke, J. 1978, *ApJ*, 226, 753

Figure captions

Fig. 1.— **Three-dimensional view of the Kennicutt and Kinney galaxies in classical Strömgren color-space.** The galaxies occupy a well-constrained subspace, inside which they are ordered roughly according to Hubble type, with early types in the upper right corner. The projections onto the three sub-planes are also shown in gray. As explained, such color coordinates are impractical for a quantitative description. circles: E and S0, triangles up: Sa - Sb, triangles down: Sc - Sd, diamonds: Im, squares: I0, pluses: unspecified Spiral, stars: the Kinney et al. starburst templates. The classification is taken from NED. Open symbols: galaxies with reported Seyfert(2) nucleus, filled symbols: no reported Seyfert activity.

Fig. 2.— **Galaxies in PCA-space.** The Kennicutt+Kinney sample viewed in 3D PCA-space. The three projections onto the PC1-PC2, PC2-PC3 and PC1-PC3 planes are also shown in gray. Differences among galaxies now spread almost solely along one axis, PC1. High values of PC1 correspond to early type galaxies, low values to late types. The dispersion along PC2, and even more so along PC3, is much smaller. The standard deviation in PC3 is of the order of the measurement uncertainties in the data. This means, that $\langle PC3 \rangle$ is an intrinsic galaxy “property”, which can be used to distinguish the ensemble of cluster galaxies from other objects, such as stars and field galaxies. The advantage of using PC-space instead of color-space is evident. The cluster-box, as defined in the text, and its projections are also shown. Symbols as in Figure 1.

Fig. 3.— **Second order k-corrections of PC colors.** Filters with central wavelengths tuned to fixed rest-frame spectral regions of galaxies at different redshifts, but of constant width, sample narrower bands of the galaxy’s spectrum with increasing z . Panels (a), (b), and (c) show the differences in PC1, PC2 and PC3 due to this effect. Different symbols are used for each template spectrum. The dash-dotted lines indicate the uncertainties corresponding to $d(u-v)=d(v-b)=d(b-y)=0.05$.

Fig. 4.— **Morphological breakup of the three sets of reference spectra.** The upper panel is the Kennicutt sample, the middle panel shows the individual Kinney et al. galaxies, and the lower panel displays the Rakos sample. Galaxies too peculiar to be assigned to any Hubble type are assigned T=15 and galaxies with no morphological entry neither in the source paper nor in NED are plotted with T=17.

Fig. 5.— **Testing for Completeness.** The large box represents the cluster-box defined in Figure 2. All normal galaxies from the Rakos test sample (see text) are located within this box and are therefore not visible in the plot. The smaller box below it encompasses the location in PC-space of Seyfert nucleus dominated galaxies. These two volumes do not

overlap. The location of weaker Sys, which have a composite spectrum of AGN + host galaxy, can be explained by a simple combination of “pure” Seyfert and “pure normal galaxy” (see section 4 for a more detailed discussion). Also shown is the internal reddening vector for $A_V=1$ (solid arrow) and its projections along each axis (dashed arrows), and the IR-bright galaxies (x-es). Such objects do not represent a separate class of galaxies but reddened versions of mixed AGN-starburst galaxies (again, see section 4).

Fig. 6.— **Contamination by stars** for observations with $0.1 \leq z_{obs} \leq 0.8$. The figure displays those stellar types that will be indistinguishable from cluster galaxies, based on their colors alone. The efficiency with which we can eliminate foreground stars is reflected by the emptiness of this figure.

Fig. 7.— **Stellar contamination in Cl0016+16**. Projection onto the (PC1, PC2) plane of the cluster-box and the stellar sequence. Different symbols are used to distinguish spectral types, and luminosity class is represented by the symbol size (large symbols for supergiants, intermediate size for giants, and small symbols for main sequence stars). Circles = O stars; pluses = B; x-es = A; triangles up = F; squares = G; triangles down = K, and diamonds = M.

Fig. 8.— **Redshift discriminating ability**. For selected galaxy templates, we show, for each redshift of observation (z_{obs}), the redshifts z_{gal} at which this type of field galaxy will be indistinguishable from cluster members. The central strips, along the principal diagonal, correspond to galaxies for which $z_{gal}=z_{obs}$, i.e., cluster members. All quiescent background galaxies (upper panels) are successfully discarded, as are most starbursts.

Fig. 9.— **Redshift discriminating ability**. Percentage of galaxies, as a function of z_{obs} and z_{gal} , whose PC-colors are within the boundaries of the cluster-box. The peak along the principal diagonal corresponds to the cluster itself.

Fig. 10.— **Differential redshift effects**. Figs. 10a-10c show - for $z_{obs} = 0.1, 0.4$ and 0.7 respectively - the cluster-box and Seyfert-box boundaries, as well as the location of three representative template galaxies (E, Sb and stb3 of Kinney et al.) in all three projections (PC1-PC2, PC2-PC3 and PC1-PC3). For each template, the tracks for $-0.1 < \delta z < +0.1$ and the intrinsic reddening vector for $A_V = 1$ are shown. Dotted lines: blueshift, dashed lines: redshift. Note how the tracks change with z_{obs} .

Fig. 11.— **Redshift discriminating ability**. Number density of visible field galaxies (solid line) as a function of z_{obs} and remaining interlopers in the cluster-box (pluses) and in the

Seyfert-box (x-es) for three apparent magnitude bins.

Fig. 12.— **Weakest detectable trend.** Percentage of unidentified interlopers in deep cluster frames as a function of overdensity and cluster redshift from $z_{obs} = 0.1$ (lowest solid line) to $z_{obs} = 0.8$ (upper dotted line) in steps of $\delta z = 0.1$ (solid and dotted lines are used alternatively for clarity). In the least favorable case ($z=0.8$, overdensity=2) the remaining field contamination (after the cluster-box test) is at most 30 %. Assuming a worst-case scenario, where all interlopers look alike in PC-space, any cluster galaxy property shared by more than 30 % of all objects can still be detected. At $z=0.1$, the weakest detectable trend need only be 10 %, and for denser regions (at any redshift), the statistical uncertainty due to remaining interlopers will be completely negligible.

Fig. 13.— **The Hubble Sequence in PC-space**

The Hubble Sequence is essentially parallel to PC1. High values correspond to early Hubble types, low values to late types. There is no visible trend of PC2 (and PC3) with Hubble type. The cluster-box is drawn in a solid line, and the dash-dotted line is indicative of the typical 0.05 mag photometric accuracy.

Fig. 14.— **Models of old stellar populations** (Worthey 1994). Instantaneous star formation bursts with solar (pluses) and sub-solar (x-es) metallicities, viewed after 1-18 Gyrs of passive evolution, are consistent with the location of Elliptical and S0 galaxies. Superpositions of bursts (not shown) look very similar.

Fig. 15.— **Models of young stellar populations** (Leitherer et al. 1999) Solar metallicity tracks with a Salpeter IMF are shown for ages from 1 to 900 Myrs. (a) Instantaneous burst, (b) continuous star formation. $A_V = 1$ is the intrinsic reddening vector. Solid rectangle: cluster-box, dash-dotted rectangle: cluster-box with typical errors, dashed rectangle: Seyfert-box.

Fig. 16.— **Perpendicular to the Hubble sequence: Identification and classification of Seyfert galaxies.** Although the Seyfert subgroups are not defined consistently with the same precision, a trend (of mainly PC3) with Seyfert type is apparent, from Sy1s (pluses) having low PC3s (below the cluster-box) to Sy2's (x-es) which are indistinguishable from normal galaxies. Circles are Sy1.2 and star symbols are Sy1.5. Typical errors are 0.05 in PC2 and 0.06 in PC3. The “normal” cluster-box is outlined by a solid line, the Seyfert-box by a dash-dotted line.

Fig. 17.— **Measuring dust extinction.** In this projection, the evolutionary tracks are aligned and the dust reddening vector makes a sufficiently large angle with them to detect

departures from the tracks due to reddening. The different symbols represent different metallicities: circles: $\log Z/Z_{\odot} = -2$, stars: $\log Z/Z_{\odot} = -1$, x-es: $\log Z/Z_{\odot} = 0$. The sub-solar metallicity tracks range from $t=8$ to $t=18$ Gyrs, the solar track covers $t=1$ to $t=18$ Gyrs. These are the age ranges available at the model’s website.

Fig. 18.— **Age vs. metallicity in PC-space.** Evolutionary tracks for varying metallicities of old stellar populations. The range of ages of the tracks (in Gyrs) is indicated in the figure. Each time-step is 1 Gyr. The symbols are as in Fig. 17.

Table 1. The Kennicutt galaxy sample

Name	Kennicutt Morph.	NED Morph.	u-v	v-b	b-y	T-type
NGC1275	Epec	cD pec Sy2	0.31	0.08	0.34	-4
NGC3379	E0	E1	0.96	0.41	0.34	-5
NGC4472	E1/S0	E2/S02	0.88	0.43	0.41	-3
NGC4648	E3	E3	0.98	0.37	0.34	-5
NGC4889	E4	cD/Db	1.00	0.38	0.29	-4
Mrk270	S0	S0? Sy2	0.79	0.27	0.22	-2
NGC3245	S0	SA(r)0 HII LINER	0.88	0.33	0.38	-2
NGC3516	S0	(R)SB(s)0 Sy1.5	0.38	0.11	0.20	-2
NGC3921	S0pec	(R')SA(s)0/a pec	0.50	0.00	0.22	0
NGC3941	SB0/a	SB(s)0	0.91	0.33	0.23	-2
NGC4262	SB0	SB(s)0-	0.92	0.33	0.30	-2
NGC5866	S0	S0	0.78	0.31	0.37	-2
NGC1357	Sa	SA(s)ab	0.65	0.22	0.27	2
NGC2775	Sa	SA(r)ab	0.82	0.26	0.33	2
NGC3368	Sab	SAB(rs)ab Sy	0.75	0.29	0.32	2
NGC3471	Sa	Sa	0.45	0.09	0.28	1
NGC3623	Sa	SAB(rs)a LINER	0.84	0.37	0.30	1
NGC5548	Sa	(R')SA(s)0/a Sy1.5	0.15	0.00	0.11	0
NGC7469	Sa	(R')SAB(rs)a Sy1.2	-0.15	-0.06	0.13	1
NGC1832	SBb	SB(r)bc	0.32	0.01	0.16	4
NGC3147	Sb	SA(rs)bc Sy2	0.58	0.11	0.23	4
NGC3227	Sb	SAB(s) pec Sy1.5	0.55	0.17	0.22	1-7
NGC3310	Sbcpec	SAB(r)bc pec	-0.08	-0.44	-0.03	4
NGC3627	Sb	SAB(s)b Sy	0.39	0.07	0.19	3
NGC4750	Sbpec	(R)SA(rs)ab LINER	0.46	0.08	0.23	2
NGC5248	Sbc	SAB(rs)bc,HII	0.32	0.06	0.20	4
NGC6217	SBbc	(R)SB(rs)bc Sy2	0.34	-0.09	0.09	4
NGC6764	SBb	SB(s)bc LINER Sy2	0.21	-0.01	0.31	4
NGC2276	Sc	SAB(rs)c	0.15	-0.15	0.05	5
NGC2903	Sc	SAB(rs)bc HII	0.33	0.05	0.24	4
NGC3690	Scpec	SBm? pec (strong int. pair)	-0.09	-0.15	0.23	9
NGC4631	Sc	SB(s)d	0.05	-0.21	-0.05	7
NGC4775	Sc	SA(s)d	0.06	-0.23	-0.01	7
NGC6181	Sc	SAB(rs)c HII	0.28	-0.06	0.20	5
NGC6643	Sc	SA(rs)c	0.39	-0.03	0.11	5
Mrk478	Im	compact	-0.40	-0.22	-0.15	11
NGC1569	Sm/Im	IBm Sy1	0.19	0.07	0.31	10
NGC4194	Smpec	IBm pec	0.19	-0.14	0.21	10
NGC4449	Sm/Im	IBm	-0.07	-0.27	-0.05	10
NGC4485	Sm/Im	IB(s)m pec	0.06	-0.27	-0.01	10
NGC5996	SBd	SB?	0.10	-0.19	0.14	1-7

Table 1—Continued

Name	Kennicutt Morph.	NED Morph.	u-v	v-b	b-y	T-type
NGC3034	I0	I0 HII	0.55	0.13	0.42	0
NGC3077	I0	I0 pec	0.40	0.04	0.18	0
NGC5195	I0pec	SB0_1 pec LINER	0.80	0.32	0.36	-2
NGC6240	I0pec	I0: pec LINER Sy2	0.52	0.07	0.31	0
Mrk35	pec	BCD/Irr	-0.28	-0.25	0.05	11
NGC7714	Spec	SB(s)b: pec HII	0.05	-0.24	0.10	3
UGC6697	Spec	Im:	-0.03	-0.21	0.06	10

Note. — Column 1 lists the galaxy name, column 2 the morphological type as listed in the source paper (Kennicutt 1992a). For completeness and consistency, we list in column 3 the morphological classification from NED and in column 7 the corresponding T-types. Columns 4-6 list the Strömgren colors used in the PCA-analysis. A histogram of the morphological breakup is shown in Figure 11. Galaxies for which no precise morphological typing could be found are counted with equal weight in each morphological bin that their classification allows.

Table 2. Kinney et al. galaxy templates

Template	Name	Morph.	NED Morph.	u-v	v-b	b-y	T-type
E	NGC1399	E1pec	E1 pec	0.92	0.47	0.36	-5
	NGC1404	E2	E1				-5
	NGC6868	E2	E2				-5
	NGC7196	E3	E:				-5
S0	NGC1023	SB0	SB(rs)0-	0.93	0.43	0.38	-2
	NGC1553	S0pec	SA(rl)0 LINER				-2
	NGC6340	SA(s)0/a	SA(s)0/a LINER				0
Sa	NGC1433	SBab	(R' l)SB(rs)ab Sy2	0.95	0.18	0.32	2
	NGC4594	Sa	SA(s)a LINER Sy2				1
	NGC4569	SABab	SAB(rs)ab LINER Sy				2
Sb	NGC210	Sb	SAB(s)b	0.73	0.23	0.31	3
	NGC7083	Sb	SAB(rs)c LINER				5
Sc	NGC598	Scd	SA(s)cd	-0.30	-0.35	-0.11	6
	NGC2403	Sc	SAB(s)cd				6
stb1 ($E(B-V) \leq 0.1$)	Tol1924-416	BCG	pec HII	0.24	-0.29	-0.07	11
	NGC1510	BCG	SA0 pec? HII				-2
	NGC1800	BCG	IB(s)m				10
	NGC1140	BCG	IBm pec: Sy2				10
	Mrk66	BCG	BCG				11,(-6)
	NGC7250	stb	Sdm?				8
	NGC5253	stb	Im pec HII				10
	Haro15	BCG	(R)SB0 pec? HII				-2
stb2 ($0.11 \leq E(B-V) \leq 0.21$)	UGC9560	BCG	Pec	-0.04	-0.34	-0.06	15
	NGC3125	BCG	S HII (pair)				1-7
	1941-543	stb	XXX				17
	Mrk357	BCG	Pair? SBnuc. Sy1				1-7
	UGCA410	stb	compact				11,-6
	NGC6052	stb	pair=Sc+Sc				5
stb3 ($0.25 \leq E(B-V) \leq 0.35$)	Mrk542	stb	Im:	0.34	-0.15	0.06	10
	NGC3049	stb	SB(rs)ab				2
	NGC5236	stb	SAB(s)c HII				5
stb4 ($0.39 \leq E(B-V) \leq 0.50$)	NGC7673	stb	(R')SAc? pec HII	0.33	-0.18	0.02	5
	NGC7793	stb	SA(s)d				7
	NGC7714	stb	SB(s)b: pec HII				3
	Mrk499	BCG	Im:				10
	NGC5996	stb	SB?				1-7
stb5 ($0.51 \leq E(B-V) \leq 0.60$)	NGC4385	stb	SB(rs)0+: HII	0.28	-0.15	0.12	-2
	1050+04	BCG	XXX				17
	NGC6090	stb	pair=Sbpec+Sbpec HII				3
	IC1586	BCG	compact HII				11
	NGC6217	stb	(R)SB(rs)bc Sy2				4

Table 2—Continued

Template	Name	Morph.	NED Morph.	u-v	v-b	b-y	T-type
	IC214	stb	XXX				17
stb6 ($0.61 \leq E(B-V) \leq 0.70$)	NGC5860	stb	pair=E+E	0.41	-0.14	0.06	-5
	NGC1313	stb	SB(s)d				7
	NGC1672	stb	(R' ₁ :)SB(r)bc Sy2				4
	NGC3256	stb	pec merger HII				15
	NGC7552	merger	SA(s)c pec HII LINER				5

Note. — Column 1 lists the template label used by Kinney et al. and column 2 gives the galaxies from which the optical part of the template spectrum was built. Types stb1-6 are templates of starbursting galaxies with different amounts of internal extinction (Calzetti, Kinney & Storchi-Bergmann 1994). Column 3 lists the types given by Kinney et al, column 4 the NED morphology, and column 8 the corresponding T-type (see histogram in Figure 11). Galaxies for which NED does not have a morphological entry are marked as XXX. Columns 5-7 are the Strömgren colors.

Table 3. The Rakos galaxy sample

Name	Morph.	NED Morph.	u-v	v-b	b-y	T-type
NGC3379	E0	E1	0.96	0.41	0.34	-5
NGC4472	E1	E2/S02	0.88	0.43	0.41	-3
NGC4648	E3	E3	0.98	0.37	0.34	-5
NGC4889	E4	cD/Db	1.00	0.38	0.29	-4
standard-E	E	XXX	0.89	0.33	0.35	17,(-5)
NGC1275	Epec-burst	cD pec Sy2	0.31	0.08	0.34	-4
NGC3245	S0	SA(r)0 HII LINER	0.88	0.33	0.38	-2
NGC5866	S0	S0	0.78	0.31	0.37	-2
NGC4262	SB0	SB(s)0-	0.92	0.33	0.30	-2
NGC3941	SB0	SB(s)0	0.91	0.33	0.23	-2
Mrk270	S0-Sy2	S0? Sy2	0.79	0.27	0.22	-2
Mrk3	S0-Sy2	S0: Sy2	0.53	0.37	0.32	-2
NGC3516	S0-Sy1	(R)SB(s)0 Sy1.5	0.38	0.11	0.20	-2
NGC3921	S0pec-merger	(R')SA(s)0/a pec	0.50	0.00	0.22	0
NGC1357	Sa	SA(s)ab	0.65	0.22	0.27	2
NGC2775	Sa	SA(r)ab	0.82	0.26	0.33	2
NGC3471	Sa	Sa	0.45	0.09	0.28	1
NGC3623	Sa	SAB(rs)a LINER	0.84	0.37	0.30	1
NGC3368	Sab	SAB(rs)ab Sy	0.75	0.29	0.32	2
NGC5548	Sa-Sy1	(R')SA(s)0/a Sy1.5	0.15	0.00	0.11	0
NGC7469	Sa-Sy1-merger	(R')SAB(rs)a Sy1.2	-0.15	-0.06	0.13	1
NGC3147	Sb	SA(rs)bc Sy2	0.58	0.11	0.23	4
NGC3227	Sb	SAB(s) pec Sy1.5	0.55	0.17	0.22	1-7
NGC3627	Sb	SAB(s)b Sy	0.39	0.07	0.19	3
NGC4750	Sb	(R)SA(rs)ab LINER	0.46	0.08	0.23	2
NGC1832	SBb	SB(r)bc	0.32	0.01	0.16	4
NGC5248	Sbc	SAB(rs)bc HII	0.32	0.06	0.20	4
NGC6764	SBb-Sy2-WR	SB(s)bc LINER Sy2	0.21	-0.01	0.31	4
NGC6217	SBbc-burst	(R)SB(rs)bc Sy2	0.34	-0.09	0.09	4
NGC3310	Sbc-merger	SAB(r)bc pec	-0.08	-0.44	-0.03	4
NGC4775	Sc	Sc	0.06	-0.023	-0.01	5
NGC6181	Sc	SAB(rs)c HII	0.28	-0.06	0.20	5
NGC6643	Sc	SA(rs)c	0.39	-0.03	0.11	5
NGC2276	Sc-merger	SAB(rs)c	0.15	-0.15	0.05	5
NGC2903	Sc-burst	SAB(rs)bc HII	0.33	0.05	0.24	4
NGC4631	Sc-burst	SB(s)d	0.05	-0.21	-0.05	7
NGC3690	Sc-merger	SBm? pec (strong int. pair)	-0.09	-0.15	0.23	9
NGC5996	SBd-burst	SB?	0.10	-0.19	0.14	1-7
NGC4449	Sm-merger	IBm	-0.07	-0.27	-0.05	10
NGC4194	Sm-merger	IBm pec	0.19	-0.14	0.21	10
NGC6052	Sm-merger	Pair=Sc+Sc	-0.10	-0.27	0.10	5

Table 3—Continued

Name	Morph.	NED Morph.	u-v	v-b	b-y	T-type
NGC1569	Sm-burst	IBm Sy1	0.19	0.07	0.31	10
NGC4485	Sm-merger	IB(s)m pec	0.06	-0.27	-0.01	10
NGC3034	I0	I0 HII	0.55	0.13	0.42	0
NGC5195	I0pec	SB0_1 pec LINER	0.80	0.32	0.36	-2
NGC3077	I0-burst	I0 pec	0.40	0.04	0.18	0
NGC6240	I0-merger	IO: pec LINER Sy2	0.52	0.07	0.31	0
UGC6697	S	Im:	-0.03	-0.21	0.06	10
NGC4670	SB-BIComGa-burst	SB(s)0/a pec:	0.10	-0.23	-0.07	0
Mrk35	pec-BIComGa-burst	BCD/Irr	-0.28	-0.25	0.05	11
NGC7714	Spec-burst	SB(s)b: pec HII	0.05	-0.24	0.10	3
3C31	cD	SA0-:	0.83	0.50	0.37	0
3C33	cD	pair	0.59	0.29	0.22	17
3C76	cD	E1?	0.78	0.44	0.40	-5,(-4)
3C78	cD	S0/a	0.77	0.49	0.42	0
3C88	cD	E pec?	0.80	0.49	0.42	-5,(-4)
3C98	cD	E1?	0.85	0.47	0.41	-5,(-4)
3C192	cD	XXX	0.83	0.38	0.32	17,(-4)
3C264	cD	E	0.74	0.41	0.35	-5,(-4)
3C293	cD	S?	0.77	0.30	0.40	1-7,(-4)
3C296	cD	XXX	0.88	0.45	0.35	17
3C305	cD	SB0	0.85	0.23	0.25	-2
Cl1604	G1	XXX	0.80	0.27	0.36	17
PHL1093	G2	XXX	0.59	0.31	0.26	17
Cl1318	G1	XXX	0.75	0.36	0.43	17
Cl1612	G1	XXX	0.60	0.21	0.31	17
Cl1610	G1	XXX	0.52	0.33	0.26	17
Cl0948	??	XXX	0.81	0.33	0.41	17
Cl1049	G1	XXX	0.72	0.49	0.27	17
Cl1607	G1	XXX	0.64	0.50	0.27	17
Cl0948.9	??	XXX	0.63	0.31	0.45	17
Cl1446a	G3	XXX	0.70	0.35	0.26	17
Cl1446b	G4	XXX	0.92	0.14	0.23	17
Cl0949	??	XXX	0.75	0.42	0.23	17
Cl0024	G1	XXX	0.87	0.38	0.45	17
CRBCL	G2	XXX	0.95	0.45	0.39	17
Cl1534	G1	XXX	0.81	0.42	0.39	17
A665	G1	XXX	0.83	0.42	0.43	17
HYG8	G9	XXX	0.82	0.35	0.36	17
A2317	G1	XXX	0.77	0.38	0.39	17
Cl1446c	G1	XXX	0.56	0.04	0.27	17
A1961	G1	XXX	0.74	0.36	0.32	17

Table 3—Continued

Name	Morph.	NED Morph.	u-v	v-b	b-y	T-type
Cl0025	G1	XXX	0.75	0.25	0.37	17
3C28	??	XXX	0.53	0.31	0.35	17
3C219	??	XXX	0.63	0.28	0.29	17
3C198	pec	XXX	0.34	0.06	0.12	17
3C277	pec	XXX	0.67	0.32	0.31	17
Mrk6	Sy1	SAB0+: Sy1.5	0.11	0.15	0.25	-2
Mrk9	Sy1	S0 pec? Sy1	-0.34	-0.08	0.02	-2
Mrk10	Sy1	SBbc Sy1	-0.36	-0.02	0.08	4
Mrk42	Sy1	SBb Sy1	0.05	0.04	0.11	3
Mrk50	Sy1	E? Sy1	-0.28	0.01	0.10	-5
Mrk69	Sy1	Sy1	-0.15	-0.17	-0.02	17
Mrk141	Sy1	E Sy1.5	-0.07	-0.01	0.10	-5
Mrk142	Sy1	S? Sy1	-0.31	-0.13	-0.02	1-7
Mrk279	Sy1	S0 Sy1.5	-0.45	-0.17	0.02	-2
Mrk290	Sy1	E1? Sy1	-0.54	-0.13	-0.13	-5
Mrk291	Sy1	SB(s)a: Sy1	-0.08	-0.11	0.08	1
Mrk304	Sy1	compact Sy1	-0.52	-0.16	-0.15	11,-6
Mrk315	Sy1	E1 pec? Sy1.5	0.22	0.07	0.21	-5
Mrk335	Sy1	S0/a Sy1	-0.60	-0.20	-0.21	0
Mrk352	Sy1	SA0 Sy1	-0.47	-0.09	-0.03	-2
Mrk358	Sy1	SAB(rs)bc: Sy1	0.02	0.12	0.18	4
Mrk464	Sy1	compact Sy1.5	-0.20	-0.07	0.05	11,-6
Mrk474	Sy1	SB(s)0/a? Sy1	0.01	0.21	0.15	0
Mrk478	Sy1	compact Sy1	-0.40	-0.22	-0.15	11,-6
Mrk486	Sy1	SBb? Sy1	-0.34	-0.11	-0.10	3
Mrk506	Sy1	SAB(r)a,Sy1.5	-0.03	0.24	0.20	1
Mrk79	Sy1-merger	SBb Sy1.2	-0.51	-0.11	-0.06	3
Mrk110	Sy1-merger	pair? Sy1	-0.44	-0.20	-0.07	17
Mrk231	Sy1-merger	SA(rs)c? pec Sy1	0.51	0.11	0.25	5
Mrk618	Sy1	SB(s)b pec Sy1	-0.35	-0.12	-0.05	3
IIZw136	Sy1	S? Sy1	-0.45	-0.24	-0.20	1-7
3C390.3	Sy1	opt.var. Sy1	-0.40	-0.04	-0.01	17
PKS2349-01	Sy1	XXX	-0.48	-0.23	-0.13	17
Mrk1	Sy2	(R')S? Sy2	0.39	0.10	0.20	1-7
Mrk34	Sy2	S Sy2	0.40	0.15	0.16	1-7
Mrk176	Sy2	SA(s)0/a pec: Sy2 (triplet)	0.76	0.24	0.26	0
Mrk268	Sy2	SBb Sy2 pair?	0.70	0.21	0.32	3
Mrk348	Sy2	SA(s)0/a: Sy2	0.49	0.22	0.30	0
Mrk372	Sy2	S0/a Sy1.5	0.68	0.35	0.37	0
Mrk78	Sy2-merger	SB Sy2	0.71	0.18	0.30	1-7
Mrk463	Sy2-merger	triplet=Sy2+Sy1+?	0.01	-0.02	0.04	17

Table 3—Continued

Name	Morph.	NED Morph.	u-v	v-b	b-y	T-type
IRAS-F17242+6339	AGN	Sy2	0.34	0.38	0.35	17
IRAS-F17418+7042	AGN	Sy2	0.13	-0.13	0.07	17
IRAS-F17428+6251	AGN	Sy2	0.11	0.03	0.54	17
IRAS-F17226+6844	AGN-burst	Irr	-0.18	-0.30	-0.06	17
IRAS-F17462+6402	AGN-burst	XXX	0.36	0.18	0.50	17
IRAS-F18066+6632	AGN-burst	XXX	-0.26	-0.04	0.34	17
IRAS-F18173+6617	AGN-burst	XXX	0.35	0.04	0.44	17
IRAS-17297+6900	AGN-burst	XXX	0.01	-0.15	0.27	17
IRAS-18121+6256	AGN-burst	XXX	0.11	0.00	0.19	17
IRAS-18423+6717	AGN-burst	XXX	0.52	0.25	0.77	17

Table 3—Continued

Name	Morph.	NED Morph.	u-v	v-b	b-y	T-type
IRAS-F17242+6637	burst	XXX	0.34	0.38	0.35	17
IRAS-F17425+6615	burst	XXX	0.13	-0.13	0.07	17
IRAS-18234+6440	burst	XXX	-0.06	-0.19	0.12	17
IRAS-F17330+7017	burst	XXX	0.26	0.31	0.32	17
IRAS-F18031+6312	burst	XXX	0.02	-0.23	-0.02	17
IRAS-F18014+6318	burst	XXX	0.39	-0.16	0.27	17

Note. — The Rakos sample does not meet the large aperture criterion. It is rather a compilation of a wide range of spectral types found in Kennicutt (1992a), Ashby, Houck & Hacking (1992), Gunn & Oke (1975), Yee & Oke (1978) and de Bruyn & Sargent (1978). This serves here to assess the necessity for the large aperture criterion, and to test whether the Kinney + Kennicutt sample covers the entire parameter space occupied by galaxies.

N.B.: In the Rakos classification (column 2), GX - where X is a number - denotes the Xth brightest galaxy of the cluster listed in column 1. Galaxies with morphologies so peculiar that no Hubble type can be assigned are given T=15 and galaxies for which no morphological classification could be found are listed as T=17.













































